

VINDICATION OF OUR BLESSED SAVIOURS Genealogy.

From the Cavils of Antiscripturists,
and the Accounts that two E-
vangelists give of it; Set in so
clear a Light, as may at once sa-
tisfy the well meaning Seeker,
and Silence the Irreligious Dispu-
tant.

Prov. 4. Vers. 24.

*Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse
lips put far from thee.*

Prov. 8. Vers. 9.

*All the words of my mouth are in righteousness, there
is nothing froward or perverse in them: they are
all plain to him that understandeth, and right
them that find knowledge.*

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OF SCOTLAND
EDINBURGH

Edinburgh, Printed by the Heirs and Successors
of Andrew Anderson, Printer to His most Ex-
cellent Majesty. 1696.

To the Reader.

THe following Observations were written some Months ago, with particular regard to the satisfaction of a young Gentleman, who by his Travelling unto several parts of Europe, had found too many occasions of Conversing with bad Company, and was by them, tempted to an ill Opinion of the Holy Scriptures.

Too many there are in this Iron and rugged Age, who contend fiercely, and scuffle endlessly, about things which (in my Conscience I am persuaded) both might and ought to be managed with less Heat and Concern. And though I cannot pretend to be altogether Dis-interested, in those lesser Broils which conspire to render this poor Church miserable; yet I should be much ashamed, if my first sally into Print, did speak me one of those, who confine true Religion to

TO THE READER.

the Interests of a Party, and the Corners of a Sect, and who spend all their Zeal and Spirits on small Matters.

When the Veracity of Divine Oracles is impudently brought in question and Impugned, by the Sophistry of half thought Arguments, I hope the Wise and Pious, will not think the design of the following Paper useless or unseasonable; If on tryal, I find that this short breathed Performance meets not with careless or unkind Reception, from those who have true Standart-witt, and whose Judgment deserves to be esteemed; I shall be encouraged to render the Publick some further accounts how I am wont to spend my Time in privat, when not diverted from Study by other necessary Cares and Business:

OBSERVATIONS.

OBSERVATIONS

on Mat. Chap. I. vers. 1. --- 17.

Whether we confine the Title contained in these words (*The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ*) to the first seventeen verses of this Chapter; or extend it to the whole Gospel of St. Matthew, is a Matter of Indifferency; for no unanswerable Reason can be given against either Interpretation. If against the First it be Objected, that a few Verses on one Column of a single Page, deserve not the Name of a Book? It may be easily replied, That such a Form of speaking amongst the Jews, is no more uncouth, than the calling a Bill of Divorce, *Liber*, or *Libellus repudii*; or that of Jer. 32. v. 11, 12 where the Evidence of a very small Purchase, hath the Title also of a Book given it. In defence of the Second, it can be told, that the word (*Generation*) doth not always relate simply to Birth or Genealogies; but often also signifieth, any inanimate Production, any Event that time brings forth; and so likewise the History or relation of any such Event or Passage. Thus Gen. 2. 4. is to be understood, not only the Creation of the Heavens and the Earth, but other Passages following: And Gen. 5. 1. must be Expounded of Adams Creation and following Life. So Gen. 37. 2. It is clear, that Jacobs own Birth, or Procreation of

his Children, is not the peculiar Matter in hand at the time, but his dwelling in *Canaan*, his love to *Joseph*, and the Passages consequent to that. So *Numb. 3. 1.* is meant the History of the Passages of *Aaron* and *Moses*, &c. So here, not only the Birth of Christ, (for that is but a very small part of this Book) nor yet only the Genealogie of Christ, for though that here follow immediately, yet makes it not up any considerable part of this Book, but the Book of the History of the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection of Christ, in all the Events that concern him, so far as they are Recorded by this Evangelist; as the Title of *St. Lukes* Book called *the Acts of the Apostles*, Includes, not only what they did, but also the most remarkable Occurrences that happened to them, in their various Progresses for propogating the Gospel.

The design of the latter part of this Verse, is to intimat that, according to the more than once repeated, and (by the *Jews*) much remarked Promises to *David*, and to *Abraham*, Jesus Christ according to the Flesh, was Lineally descended of them : This was so much in the Evangelists eye, (as a proper Argument to convince the *Jews*, that the Son of *Josephs* Spouse was the true *Messiah*) that in his whole account of our Saviours Genealogy, he observes no more strictness of full Account or Particularity of Enumeration, than was necessary to make appear, that he derived his Pedigree from those eminent Fathers already mentioned; and the due Consideration of this, will be singularly useful to reconcile the Difference of Reckonings in this Chapter, from those

Subject is after another manner treated of.

Before I descend to more particulars, it is fit that some things in general be Premised. As first, It is no new thing, to hear Objections proposed against the two Evangelists, as irreconcilable in this Matter; for *Celsus* and *Porphyry*, and *Julian*, did the same; and both the *Ebionite* and *Manichean* Hereticks, did on this account, Expunge the Genealogy of Christ out of the Gospel.

Secondly, though perfect and satisfactory, oral Traditions in so Intricat a Point, cannot be expected or leaned on at this distance of Time: And though the publick Tables are long ago lost, from which the Evangelists may reasonably be presumed to have drawn their Accounts, yet by many Authors acurately Skilled in the study of antient Records, it is believed on most competent Grounds, that till the last destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Vespasian*, and the consequent total Subversion of the *Jewish* Polity, it was easie for any curious or inquisitive Person, to get punctual satisfaction in this or the like Controversies, from the *Archives* relating to those Matters, which were very exactly kept by the *Jews*, and most especially such as concerned the Genealogies of the Sons of *David*, because of their longing Expectations of the *Messiah* from out of his Race.

Thirdly, as the Generality of the *Jews* were bitter Enemies to the Gospel, so they were nicely Studious, and most contentiously Critical in the matter of Genealogies: and therefore it is not to be doubted, but that if they could have found any Flaw in the Evangelists relations on this Head,

A 4

they

they would not failed of improving it to the discredit of their whole History ; but it is not pretended that they ever declared Dissatisfaction in this Point, and therefore we may assuredly conclude, that they had no plausible Ground whereon to build an Objection.

Fourthly, Its believed on good Reasons, that *St. Matthew* writ his Gospel, mainly for the use of the *Jews* ; and to suppose that he had so little honesty or common sense, as to throw a Choaking or Stumbling-block in the very Entrance of his History, by a blundering and false account of his Lineage, whom he would have them believe in as the true *Messiah*, is a Thought which any sober person will conclude, to be very injurious and unworthy of him. Much more equitable it is, to think, that he knew he wrote nothing of our Saviours Genealogy, but what could bear the Test of a Scrutiny and Comparison with their own Authenrick Records.

Vers. 2. Hath nothing remarkable in it, but the general mention of *Judas* his Brethren, together with himself, for which these probable Reasons may be given. First, *Ishmael* and *Esau*, the Brothers of *Isaac* and *Jacob*, had not such direct or immediat Interest in the promised Seed, as the Sons of *Jacob* ; who, with their Progeny, were all of them in peculiar manner, Adopted to be the People of God.

Secondly, It was fit to recommend Jesus to all the *Israelites*, and particularly to those of the dispersed Tribes, as having some Relation according to the Flesh, to every one of them.

Vers. 3. *Zara* is named with his Brother *Pha-*

12, because of the remarkable Passage at their Birth, recorded *Gen. 38. vers. 28. 29.* as if they had strove which should be the first-born, and the Progenitor of Christ.

As for the mention of their Mother, it is remarkable, that in the whole reckoning of our Saviours Genealogie by the Evangelist, (besides the Blessed Virgin herself) such Women were named for Mothers, as were either of Gentile Extract, (as *Rachel* and *Ruth*) or Note of Criminal Guilt, as *Thamar* and *Uriahs* Wife, one stained with Incest, and the other with adultery : If a reason of this be asked, it is most agreeable to suppose, that such an account is a designed Prolusion to the Gospel of Christ, by which, Gentile Idolaters, and Sinners of all sorts and sizes, were to be called and converted.

Vers. 4, 5, 6. Have nothing difficult or observable in them, save that *Aram* in the *Syriack*, is the same with *Ram*, *Ruth* 4. 19. in the *Hebrew* Language, and that *David* for Honours sake, is mentioned with the Title of King : for considering how tumultuary and unprosperous the choice of *Saul* was, and how Regular the Advancement of *David* to Royal Dignity, by the unextorted Approbation; and unquestionable good pleasure of Heaven, and most agreeable to the ancient Promises in favour of *Judahs* Tribe ; it is not absurd nor amiss, to reckon the change of the *Israelitish* Government from that of Judges to Kings, from *Dauids* commencing Sovereign.

Vers. 7, 8. We meet with no rub here, till we come to *Joram*, who is said to have begot *Ozias*, otherwise called *Azariah* the Son of *Ama-
ziah*,

Abah, who was indeed his immediat Parent, 2
King. 15. 1. 1 Chr. 3. 12. and himself the Son
of *Joash* the Son of *Abaziah*, the immediat Son of
Joram; So as it is plain, that three Kings of *Ju-*
dah are here omitted, which may be accounted
for by more reasons than one: As first, it is not
against the received Rules of Speech, to affirm
of the great Grand-father, or any distant Proge-
ni that he begat the great Grand-child, or any
constant Off-spring, as 1 Chr. 4. 1. com-
par. cap. 2. vers. 50. Secondly, (as I
already hinted) the Evangelists principal
design, was to shew, that Jesus was lineally de-
scended of *David*, and to this, a strict Enumera-
tion of all Particulars was not absolutely necessa-
ry: besides it is palpable, that by dividing his
account Total into three Periods, and each of
these again into fourteen Generations, he had
more respect to the ease of the Readers memory,
than the nice and less profitable satisfaction of his
Curiosity, by the exact recording of every in-
dividual persons Name, which by the Laws of
strict and full Computation, might have here
claimed its place: he had found fourteen Gene-
rations in the first Period (from *Abraham* to
David) and in reckoning the other two, he ob-
serves only the same number as sufficient for his
intended Purpose: as to the omission of these
three Kings, here *Abaziah*, *Joash* and *Amaziah*,
rather than any other three; perhaps it was in-
tended as a Brand on their Idolatrous and In-
auspicious Reigns; and in part, an Accomplish-
ment of those Curses, which were more than once
Denounced against *Abah*, and the memory of his
House,

House, for from him on the Mothers side, they derived their Pedigree, 2 Chr. 21. 6. And that this penal Act of Oblivion, reacheth only to the fourth Generation, is consentaneous to the Law against Idolatry, Exod. 20. 5. Thus by some the omission of *Joab*, in the Catalogue of *Dauids* Worthies, and of *Cain*, 1 Chr. 1. and of *Dan*, Rev. 7. is reckoned as a Disgrace intended them for their Crimes, but enough of this.

Vers. 9, 10. Have no difficulty nor ground for Controversy in them.

Vers. 11. Is much tossed by Interpreters, as having given occasion to one of *Prophties* Objections against the Christians, becaule both in the Books of the *Kings* and *Chronicles*, its found, that *Jechonias* or *Coniah*, or *Jehoiachin*, (for he hath all these names given him in several places of Scripture) was only the Grand-child of *Josiah*, by *Jehoiakim* or *Jechonias*, one of his four Sons, and his immediat Successor in the Kingdom. But what I said on *vers. 8.* concerning *Joram*, his begetting *Ozias*, may deserve to be considered here also; or if this seem not satisfactory here, let us suppose upon the Authority of an ancient Manuscript or two, (mentioned by *Robert* and *Henry Stevens* two Famous Printers, and by *Faber Stapulensis*) that the ordinary Text is corrupted through the fault of careless Scriveners, and that the Defect ought to be Supplied by the Interposition of *Jehoiakim*, *Joakim* or *Eliakim*, betwixt *Josiah* and *Jechoniah*, and then the difficulty is over. But a corruption of almost all the received Copies of Scripture, (even in the least material Point) ought not lightly to be supposed, though

though (besides the Authors already named) Epiphanius, Pareus, Kemnitius, and Maldonat the very learned Jesuit, have Recourse to it here, and though the ordinary Margents of Bibles, take notice also of this different reading; Let us then Thirdly suppose, that *vers. 11. Jeconiah* or *Jehoiakim* the Father is understood, and that he is competently distinguished from his Son *Jeconiah*, *vers. 12.* First, by the mention of his Brethren, whereas we read at most but of one Brother properly so called, that his Son had. Secondly that the Son *vers. 12.* is sufficiently distinguished from the Father *vers. 11.* by being said to Live and Act after the Transportation of himself and many of his People, into *Babylon*; whereas the Father, *Jehoiakim's* immediat Son and Successor, dyed at *Jerusalem*, a little before the Captivity of his Son *Jeconiah*, *1 King. 24. 6.* The latter part of *vers. 11.* must be construed by way of *Antithesis, Opposition* or *Contra distinction*, to the beginning of *vers. 12.* and so must signifie with some Latitude, a different Period of Time from the Transportation its self into *Babylon*, that is a little Space before the Captivity; which in a few years, reached to all *Jehoiakims* Brethren: and though himself were permitted to live and die at *Jerusalem*; yet it was but a poor disgracefull Tributary, and disquieted Reign he had, as one of *Nebuchadnezzars* Vassals, and next Degree to Captivity. And *Jer. 22. 19.* It is Prophecied, that he should have the Burial of an Ais, Drawn and cast forth beyond the Gates of *Jerusalem*, and according to *Josephus*, the Enemy slew him in the City, and commanded him to be cast before the

the

the words are buried, come in to the Prediction.
Jer. 36. 30. where it's said, that his dead body
should be cast out in the day time to the heat, and in
the night to the frost.

The general mention of his Brethren, together
with himself, is, because each of them had his
little turn of Sovereignty, mean and precarious
as it was. *Vers. 12, &c.* For clearing the diffi-
culties that occur in this, and the following Ver-
ses, I have found none that goes so judiciously
and neatly to Work, as *Grotius* that great Master,
both of rational Discourse, and critical Observa-
tion: some days ago, I had only a few hours
perusal of his most learned Commentaries on the
Evangelists, but (if I rightly remember) this
is his Method: First, he takes for granted, that
the Divine Historians, had both of them free Ac-
cess to, and made careful use of the publick Re-
gisters, such as that mentioned, *Nehem. 7. 64.*
Secondly, that those Records and the remem-
brance of them, having long since perished, fair
and probable Conjecture is the most that can be
expected from, or ought to be pretended by any,
that undertakes to clear the Scruples that occur
on this Subject, according to the ancient saying,
Qui bene conjexit Vatem, perhibebo optimum. Third-
ly, he proves by unanswerable Reasons, that both
the Evangelists Trace out *Josephs* Pedigree in
different Forms: *St. Matthew* observing the Or-
der of Legal Succession, and *St. Luke* that of na-
tural Descent. Fourthly, he holds it plain and
undoubted, that though *St. Luke* in his Retro-
grade Catalogue, over-leaps none of the natural
Descendants; yet *St. Matthew* is not near so ex-
act

act in his Enumeration of legal Successors. Finally, that to fill up all the Blanks of St. *Matthews* Reckoning, with a true account of their Names who are left out, is a thing impossible to be done at this day, as the Prophet would be very inconsiderable, though it could be performed. But so far as the Old Testament, or ancient Traditions afford Light, to piece up the Reckoning, and make it run somewhat parallel to St. *Lukes*. *Grotius* makes his best use of them, and in due place, I shall set down his Tables as I Extracted them out of him. But here it will be proper to satisfy some Objections, as first. That of *Celsus* and *Julian*: To what purpose was it, to give account of *Josephs* Extract, seeing he was not the Father of Christ? To this several answers may be given, As first, Christ was not dis-interested in *Josephs* Lineage, because he was born of her whom *Joseph* held in lawful Marriage by an Influence; which as it was Supernatural, was also beyond question lawful, and he was educated under *Josephs* Tutelage; and by the Rules of Analogy, the received Laws and Customs of the *Jews*, with Reference to Adoption, are so far Applicable to this case, that Jesus might justly been reputed *Josephs* Heir.

Secondly, (which is closer to the purpose) *Eusebius* and others deliver for certain, that though the Patrimony were but very small, yet *Mary* was an Heiress, as having no Brothers, and the Statute *Numb.* 36. 8. was positive and peremptory, that such should not Marry, but to one of the Descendants of their Fathers Family, that the Children of *Israel* might enjoy every one the Inheritance

~~the Name of the Father~~ If therefore either *Joseph* or *Mary* were of *Dauids* Lineage, the other behoved to be so also; and consequently the Deduction of *Dauids* Line to *Joseph*, who (both by Construction of Law was the Legal, and in vulgar Belief, was reputed the Father of Christ by nature) was sufficient to prove Jesus to be the Son of *David*, according to the much regarded ancient Prophecies, and the Evangelists declared Intention.

Object. 2. Its the Question of every Reader, why does *St. Matthew* reckon from *Solomon*, and *St. Luke* from his Brother *Nathan*? To this its Answered, that only *Solomon* and his Off-spring, had the Right of Succession to *Dauids* Kingdom, till their Line failed in *Jechoniah*, who was first succeeded by his Uncle *Zedekiah*; afterwards by *Affir*, (as *Grotius* sets it) and then by *Salthiel* the Natural Son of *Neri*, one of *Nathans* Posterity; in *Lukes* Roll, the by-reason of his Right of Legal Succession, Listed both here, and *1 Chr. 3. 17.* as Son to *Jechoniah*, which *Grotius* takes hold of, as a special Argument, to prove, that *Matthew* follows the right of Succession, and *Luke* the Order of natural Descent.

Object. 3. How can *Zorobabel* be the Son of *Salthiel*, seing *1 Chron. 3. 19.* he is called the Son of *Pedaiah*. To this I Answer, that both *Ezra Cap. 5. vers. 2.* and *Haggai Cap. 1. vers. 1.* call the great *Zorobabel*, who is here meant, the Son of *Salthiel*, which together with different Names of his Sons, who is named *1 Chron. 3.* is sufficient Argument to make it very credible, that *Zorobabel* there spoken of, (however he might be of the

tioned:

In clearing the Difficulties that occur betwixt *Zorobabel*, and *Joseph* the Husband of *Mary*, we must be beholden to Tradition, so far as it pretends to give us Light, and thus the account shall run. The Line of *Abiud*, (as eldest Son and Heir to *Zorobabel*) is followed by *St. Matthew* without Omission or Interruption, (as *Grotius* supposes) till we come to *Eleazar*, and after him he reckons seven Generations over-leapt, till we come to *Matthan*, who (according to a very ancient Tradition, Recorded by *Africanus* a Writer in the primitive days of Christianity) dyed without any Children by his Wife *Estha*, so that in him *Abiuds* Line failed: But according to the Law and Custom of the *Jews*, the Marriage of the Childless Widow, became due to him who was Prince, or Chief of the next or second Family, that he might raise Seed for preserving the Name and Memory of the Dead: and thus *Melchi* the Descendant of *Rhesa*, *Zorobabels* younger Son, became the second Husband of *Estha*, and had by her three Sons *Jacob*, called also *Panther*, (according to a Tradition mentioned by *Epiphanius*, and hinted at both by *Celsus* and some *Jewish* Writers) from his natural Fathers Sirname, though in construction of Law, he were the Son and Heir of the deceased *Matthan*: *Eli* the second, *Levi* the third Son. *Eli* begat *Joseph*, who by the death of *Jacob* his Fathers elder Brother without Children, and (it seems) without Marriage; or else his Wife being past the Age of Bearing before he dyed, or dead before himself, so as there was no place for raising

up

up Seed to him by any near Kinsman, became Heir to him, and upon the account of Succession to his Inheritance, was his Son in the Stile of Law, and so he had at once his Uncle *Jacob* for his Legal, and *Eli* for his natural Father, which conciliates *Mat. 1 16.* with *Luk 3. 23* *Levi* the third Son of *Melchi*, and one of *Josephs* Uncles, begat (according to Tradition mentioned by some *Grecian* Writers) *Barpanther*, who begat *Panther*, who begat *Jehoia*kim or *Eliakim* the Father of *Mary Josephs* Spouse: thus the same *Levi* was *Josephs* Uncle, and the Father of *Maries* Great Grand-Father.

If according to this reckoning, it shall be thought that there behoved to be too great a disproportion betwixt *Joseph* and *Maries* Age; Let us but suppose first, that *Eli* was sixty years when he begat *Joseph*, and *Joseph* forty one, when he Espoused *Mary*; Let us suppose next, that *Levi* was ten years younger than his Brother *Eli*, and so but fifty when *Joseph* was born. Secondly, that at twenty he begat *Barpanther*, that is thirty years before *Josephs* Birth. Thirdly, that *Barpanther* begat *Panther* about the twentieth year of his Age, that is ten years before *Josephs* Birth. Fourthly, that *Panther* begat *Eliakim* at 18, when *Joseph* was eight years old. Fifthly, that *Eliakim* begat *Mary* at 18, and so *Joseph* was aged 26 when *Mary* was born. Sixthly, that *Mary* was 15 at the time of her Espousals, which (if I rightly remember) is the age assigned her by *Baronius*, and other Ecclesiastick Writers, according to this Reckoning, *Joseph* was 41 years at the time of his Marriage. None of the fore-named Suppositions

B

are

are impossible or hard to be granted, and that the justness of the whole account may be more easily comprehended at one view, I set down the following Tables.


| | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------------------|
| Eli 30 | Levi 20 | Barpanther 1. |
| Eli 50 | Levi 40. | Barpanther 20 Panther 1. |
| Eli 68 | Joseph 8 | Panther 20 Eliakim 1. |
| Joseph 26 | | Eliakim 13 Mary 1. |
| Joseph 41 | Mary 15 | |

Vers. 17. After what hath been already said, Doctor *Hammonds* Paraphrase on *vers. 17.* is sufficient to explain it thus: the Genealogie here set down, not by Enumeration of all the severals which Succeeded one another from *Abraham* to *David*, may for Memories sake, be divided into three Fourteens: one of those from *Abraham* to *David* before they were Kings: a Second from *David* to the Captivity, whilst they enjoyed the Regal Power entire: the Third from the Captivity to Christ, when there were only some weak Remainders of the Regal Power among the Jews.

OBSERVATIONS

OBSERVATIONS on Luke 3. v. 24. 36. & 38.

BOth the Evangelists have the same Design, and the same Subject, but differ in the manner of handling it. St. *Matthew* follows the order of Legal Succession, and therefore he reckons from *Solomon*, and tho his natural Line failed about the time of the captivity, yet the Succession was kept up by another Branch of *Dauids* Family, to wit, *Nathans* posterity, who becoming *Solomons* Heirs by the Legal Right, now devolved on them through the defect of his own natural off-spring, are without any Scruple reckoned by the Evangelists for *Solomons* true Progenie, because such they were, indeed in construction of Law, thus *Jechoniah* is said to beget *Salathiel*: Again, tho *Zorobabels* Lineage, Branched it self into two by his sons, *Abiud* and *Rhesa*, and tho *Abiuds* Line failed in *Matthan*, yet because the Succession was kept up by the Posterity of *Rhesa* the younger Brother, he reckons from *Abiud* the Elder; and when his Line fails, Inserts *Jacob* the natural Son of *Melchi*, as the Son of *Matthan*, because he was his Heir, and *Joseph* the natural Son of *Eli*, as the Son of *Jacob*, because he became his Uncle, *Jacobs* Heir.

St. *Luke* follows the order of natural generation, in a retrògrade Line, to the first Father of
 Mankind

Mankind (as writing his Gospel with special Respect to the Gentiles, and because Christ was promised to all Nations Gen. 3. 15) with such exactness, that nothing is questioned in this whole Account, which keeps close the natural Lines, that held on without interruption: but the mention of *Matthat* and *Levi* vers. 24. And of *Cainan* v. 36.

Concerning these three, *Lucas, Brugenfis,*) as he is Cited by the industrious Mr. *Pool*, in his *Synopsis*) tells us that *Johannes Cordesius* (an Author whom he highly values and commends) had convinced him by two dissertations on the Subject; that in the most Ancient Copies, those Names were not to be found; and to this purpose he vouches the Authority of *Frenaus, Africanus, Gregory, Nazianzene, Jerome* and others. The way how they came to be inserted in Latter Copies he thinks this, that (as *Damascene* reports from either now lost Authors, or Oral tradition) *Melchi* was also called *Matthat*, as his other name, and so the blundering Transcribers inserted, both as if they had denoted two different Persons of *Levi*, he supposes, that upon report of *Melchi's* having a Son so called, some unskilful Writers thought the Account of *Josephs* Lineage could not be compleat without him, tho indeed (according to the account I have already given) he did properly belong to *Mary's* Line, and not to *Josephs*, which by both Evangelists is directly pursued.

Vers. 36. Concerning *Cainan* (after much rolling of thoughts on various opinions of the Learned) I take this for the best, and truest account. There were two Editions of the *Septuagint Translation*.

lation, both inserted by *Origen* in his *Hexapla* or six-fold-pillared Copy, in him, the first and best Edition, hath no mention of *Cainan*, the second hath, but with an obelisk, or mark to intimate, that he judged it a Spurious Addition, this is attested by *Protopius* on *Gen. 11*. In the after Editions of *Origens Hexapla* (to the Churches great loss) the Obelisks, and Asterisks &c. Were omitted, and so *Cainans* name passing without controversie, amongst such Writers as only considered the Latest, most common and least Correct Edition of the *Septuagint*, they thought the Addition of it necessary, to fill up a supposed Blank in *St. Luke's* reckoning. This Account is, considerably fortified by what *Beza* relates, viz. That some Manuscript Copies of *St. Luke's Gospel* omit *Cainan*, and particularly a very old One having most venerable marks of Antiquity in it, which belonged once to the Church of Lyons, and hath been since Transported to *Cambridge*.

Verse. 38. The calling of *Adam* the Son of God, because Created by his more Immediat Hand, than the after generations of Mankind, makes a fair Step towards the Belief of *Jesus*, his extraordinary Conception and Birth, for to give humane Form to a dead and shapeless lump of Clay, and animat it with a Rational Soul, is equally hard Work, as to make a virgin conceive and bring forth without the help of a man.

I firmly perswade my self, that no objection can be urged against the accounts I have set down of this whole matter, to which I cannot give rational and satisfactory Answers, after the Pains I have taken, to consider all that is, or can be well

well into the subject, and therefore, according to my promise, I shall conclude this Paper, with the extract of Grotius, his Tables, which will fill up the remainder of this Sheet which (and no more) I designed to fill up before I put Pento work.

David.

Matth.

Luke.

Solomon

Nathan

Roboam

Mattatha

Abia

Mainan

Afa

Melca

Josaphat

Eliakim

Joram

Jonan

Achazia

Joas

Amasia

omitted

Joseph

Juda

Simeon

Levi

Ozias qui & Azarias

Mattan

Joatham

Jorim

Achaz

Eliezer

Ezekia

Jsc

Manasse

Er

Amon

Elmodam

Josias

Cosam

Jechonias, i. est Jehoiakim.

Addi

Jechonias alter sine Liberis mortuus. Melchi
Zedechias Patruus & Hæres Jechoniae posterioris
Neri. Asser post Zedechiam Jechoniae Hæres.

Salathiel

Salathiel Neri filius heres Affiris & Jechoniz.
Zorobabel Salathielis filius & heres-

Abiud
Eliakim
Azor
Sadoc
Achim
Eliud
Eleazar
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus
Anonymus

Resa
Johanna
Juda
Joseph
Semei
Mattathias
Maath
Nagga
Elsi
Naum
Amos
Mattathias
Joseph
Janna.

Mattha prior maritus
Estha, sine Liberis mor-
tuus.

Melchi posterior ma-
ritus Estha, later natu-
ralis Jacobi.

Jacob qui & Panther
Matthanis, filius legalis
ex Estha, frater Elis &
Levis natura.

Eli Levi.

Joseph filius Eli natura,
Jacobi heres Mariae Ag-
natus proximus.

Barpanther.

Panther.
Jehoiakim qui & Elia-
kim.

Idem Levi Josephi pa-
trius

Maria Josepho Nupta.
Mariæ Abavus fuit.



